UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,840	06/22/2006	Devin Dressman	001107.00581	6445
22907 7590 10/29/2010 BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD. 1100 13th STREET, N.W.			EXAMINER	
			WOOLWINE, SAMUEL C	
SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1637	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/29/2010	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/562,840	DRESSMAN ET AL.
Examiner-initiated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	SAMUEL C. WOOLWINE	1637
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_
(1) <u>SAMUEL C. WOOLWINE</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>SARAH A. KAGAN</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 26 October 2010	Time: <u>11:45 am</u>	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant  ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: Rejections under section 103 of the Office action mailed 09/15/20	10.	
Claims discussed: n/a		
Prior art documents discussed: n/a		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary</li> </ul>	examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
/Samuel Woolwine/ Primary Examiner (A	pplicant/Applicant's Representati	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Parties discussed MPEP 715.02(I) regarding the swearing behind one of a combination of references, specifically: "Where a claim has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on Reference A in view of Reference B, with the effective date of secondary Reference B being earlier than that of Reference A, the applicant can rely on the teachings of Reference B to show that the differences between what is shown in his or her 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit or declaration and the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art prior to the date of Reference A. However, the 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit or declaration must still establish possession of the claimed invention, not just what Reference A shows, if Reference A does not teach the basic inventive concept."

In this case, it appears to the Examiner that the "basic inventive concept" is performing PCR in an emulsion with beads, primers, other PCR reagents and sample nucleic acid to form a population of beads, each bead having multiple copies of a single species of nucleic acid sequence immobilized thereon (which may be the same as or different from the nucleic acid species immobilized on other beads), and analyzing the sequence of the immobilized nucleic acids. In this respect the affidavit submitted 03/23/3009 shows this concept. Therefore, in accordance with MPEP 715.02(I), the Examiner vacates the previous Office action (mailed 09/15/2010) and withdraws the section 103 rejections made therein. A new Office action will be issued in response to Applicant's last reply filed 09/08/2010..